DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 163 SP 007 889

AUTHOR Willower, Donald J.
TITLE Some Comments on Inquiries on Schools and Pupil Control.
PUB DATE Apr 74
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, Illinois, April 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Literature Reviews; *School Organization; *Student Attitudes; *Student Behavior; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS Pupil Control

ABSTRACT

This speech, by the co-author of a bibliography of studies of pupil control, reviews literature on that subject, differentiating between studies on Pupil Control Ideology (PCI) and Pupil Control Behavior (PCB), describing instances of their interrelationship, and weighing the various merits of PCI and PCB instruments. The author concludes that more work should deal with pupil control as it bears on and is affected by fundamental structural features of schools. A four-page bibliography is included. (JA)

ED 090163

27.11

SOME COMMENTS ON INQUIRIES ON SCHOOLS AND PUPIL CONTROL

Donald J. Willower
Professor of Education
The Pennsylvania State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Genesis

Just a dozen years ago a colleague and I embarked on a field study in which we explored social system features of a single school. A major conclusion of that work was that preoccupation with pupil control permeated the life of the school, influencing normative and other social structures, as well as relationships among the various members and clients of the organization.[1]

Two closely intertwined lines of thought were spurred by this investigation. One centered on the character of the public school as a social organization.[2] The portrait of the school that was drawn was of an organization marked by a mutually mandated relationship with student clients, vague and diverse goals, ambiguous criteria of success, lack of a widely accepted work technology, high population density and stimulus overload, especially for teachers, a host of logistical problems and the political vulnerability of a public agency.

It was contended that this setting spawns a teacher subculture in which client control is of paramount concern, and a student subculture devoted to gaining a degree of autonomy in the face of organizational

---

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 1974.

SP 007 889

demands and constraints. A signal feature of this theorizing was its attention to structures that function, often in latent modes, to reduce uncertainty and enhance organizational stability. Examples include norms in the teacher group that sustain the maintenance of social distance between teachers and students, routinization that promotes the universalistic treatment and processing of clients, restricted entry and controlled inspection of the work of the school, ornamental innovations and public relations efforts. These structural elements variously contribute to internal order and the dampening of external turbulence but all of them foster organizational adaptation.

The second line of thought sought to develop concepts that could facilitate a program of inquiry of a relatively traditional type. In a paper that attempted to span the gap between the field study and more traditional investigations, the concepts of internal and external control bases were elaborated and some hypotheses were presented.[3] Later, the concepts of humanistic and custodial pupil control orientations replaced this formulation, and an operational definition for educators' pupil control views, the pupil control ideology (PCI) form was constructed. The first work using this instrument to test a number of predictions about organizational position and level, socialization and dogmatism, and PCI appeared in monograph form in 1967.[4] Since that time, a large number of studies have been carried out, and a companion instrument, the pupil control behavior (PCB) form, has been devised.[5]

Last year the original monograph was reprinted with an annotated bibliography of nearly 70 pupil control studies,[6] affording an opportunity to review and reflect upon the course of this work. To do so is the main purpose of this paper.

Selected Studies

An exhaustive examination of pupil control investigations will not be presented. Rather, selected studies will be cited to render an account of general trends, suggest areas of synthesis, ventilate gaps and limitations, and expedite additional theoretical conjecture.

We chose to begin with ideology rather than behavior, so the bulk of the studies are of PCI. A relatively small amount of PCB research has been completed to date.

A host of investigations have pursued the relationship of a multitude of teacher predispositions and characteristics, and PCI. Low dogmatism, high sense of power, commitment to emergent rather than traditional values, low status obeisance or deference, high creativity, and a high level of self-actualization all have been reported to be associated with humanistic teacher PCI.[7] Teachers' local-cosmopolitan, and professional orientations also were found to be related to a humanistic PCI as was high expressed own and wanted behaviors of inclusion, control, and affection as measured by Schutz's FIRO-B scale.[8] However, teacher level of self-esteem, race, and personality characteristics included in Stern's Activities Index, failed to predict PCI.[9]

The composite picture that emerges from these investigations is a coherent one. There are few surprises and little cause for theoretical wonder. In fact, in most of these studies predictions based on a conceptual rationale were made and confirmed. In addition, it is worth noting that the general tendency is for personal features that ordinarily would be deemed desirable, at least in our society, to be associated with teacher humanism.

Compared with their more custodial counterparts, teachers who are humanistic in PCI exhibit more student centered verbal behavior on some of the dimensions measured by Flanders' methods, and show more favorable attitudes toward and greater use of classroom practices recommended in an innovative curricular program. Moreover, there is a direct relationship between teacher pupil control behavior and student attitudes toward school. The more humanistic the teacher, the more favorable the student attitudes.[10]

A number of inquires have been concerned with organizational elements. Formal position is related to PCI. Principals and counselors are more humanistic than teachers. Teacher trainers are more humanistic than cooperating teachers. In a Canadian sample, it was found that parents were more custodial in PCI than teachers.

Educators in elementary schools consistently have been shown to be more humanistic in PCI than their secondary school counterparts but this relationship is clouded by the sex variable since, in some studies, women have displayed a more humanistic PCI than men. One piece of research reported that senior high school teachers were more custodial in PCI than junior high school teachers, while another indicated that junior high teachers were more custodial than middle school teachers.[11]

Teachers' PCI was not associated with their perceptions of administrator control style but preferred educational framework of the administrator predicted special education teachers' PCI. Teachers in schools characterized by punishment centered bureaucratic styles were more custodial than those in schools exhibiting representative bureaucratic styles. Examinations of school organizational climate and faculty PCI concluded that openness in climate is associated with humanistic ideology. Schools marked by student

unrest tended to have more humanistic faculties than matched schools without unrest. Again using the school as the unit of analysis, custodial PCI of faculty has been connected with student alienation, and high student absenteeism and suspension rates.[12]

Teacher socialization is a topic which has been explored in several longitudinal studies. The general conclusion is that student teaching and the first year of teaching both evoke increased levels of custodialism in PCI, although this may be less pronounced in the primary grades where teacher norms presumably are somewhat less consistent with a custodial orientation. Socialization press, represented by the perceived PCI of the cooperating teacher, also appears to affect changes in student teacher PCI, as do task realities for first year teachers. Similar longitudinal studies are currently being conducted in Australia.[13]

In connection with community factors bearing on pupil control, one investigation showed that teachers in low socioeconomic status (SES) elementary schools were more custodial in PCI than those in middle or high SES schools, while another indicated that the lower the SES of the community, the more custodial the PCI of the high school faculty. However, the pupil control behavior of faculty members in urban secondary schools did not differ on the basis of student SES. The post factum explanation was that the increasing militancy of relevant community groups dampened the behavioral expression of custodialism.

A study of perceived community viewpoints on education reported that teacher perceptions of traditional community views correlated with custodialism in teacher PCI. A striking feature of this research, which utilized a sample of schools serving American Indian students, was the strength of the correlation for federal boarding schools and the degree of custodialism

of these schools compared with mixed schools and those without Indian students.[14]

In order to conduct another kind of inquiry, the PCI Form was validated for use in examining subjects' perceptions of the PCI of others. Predicted pluralistic ignorance or shared misperceptions were found when teachers, principals, and counselors estimated the PCI of other teachers and principals. All groups saw teachers and principals as more custodial than actually was the case. Counselor PCI was accurately perceived by teachers but principals and counselors believed that counselors were somewhat more humanistic than they actually were. In a second study, the congruence of perceived colleague and self PCI, dubbed conformity, was not predicted by low teacher self-esteem. A third investigation discovered that teacher job satisfaction was related to the congruence of teacher self and perceived colleague PCI as hypothesized. The latter two studies also reported pluralistic ignorance in a custodial direction.[15]

The development of an operational definition for educator pupil control behavior has enabled us to address the ideology-behavior interface. As might be expected given the constraints of organizational life, the correlation between PCI and PCB is significant but moderate. This finding holds for educators as a group, and for teachers, principals, and counselors, separately. The relationship between dogmatism and PCB appears to be mediated by PCI.[16] However, the bulk of the PCB work remains to be done.

Discussion

In general, it seems that most of the studies on pupil control have worked out, in the sense that directional hypotheses were not rejected. By and large, they were supported empirically. Furthermore, conflicting

results are rare. Some ambiguity exists concerning school level and sex. This stems from an obvious interaction between these variables but it requires clarification to gain a better understanding of the differences between the essentially female elementary school faculty and that of the more male secondary school.

Pupil control inquiries typically have avoided predictive slips. This reflects the advantage afforded by concepts grounded in prior field work and theory. Pupil control is a central element in the social system of the school and, as such, apparently is associated with an array of school and faculty characteristics.

Many of the studies simply have added new variables not previously scrutinized. Others have built on, refined, or elaborated upon prior work. The longitudinal investigations of teacher socialization and PCI are an example of a planned improvement on the earlier cross-sectional exploration of socialization. These show increased custodialism during student teaching and the first year but not the second year of teaching.

In speculating about these results now, it may be that fairly rigid views on pupil control are so central an aspect of teaching that they are acquired quite quickly by most teachers. Further, this may be buttressed by a survival factor so that the teacher who completes his first year without major disaster, like the fledgling pilot who solos, or the recruit who endures his first fire, gains a measure of acceptance from colleagues and hence, faces fewer pressures. Moreover, perhaps the autonomy norm that gives each teacher at least a bounded leeway becomes more fully operational after survival seems assured.[17]

Some studies utilize subtler conceptualizations than their predecessors. The pluralistic ignorance research builds on prior work in this way, and the

inquiries that explore the congruence of self and perceived colleague PCI build on the pluralistic ignorance work in the same manner. Perceived colleague PCI represents an indirect measure of normative press, a fundamental aspect of organizational life.

The PCI-PCB relationship, the nexus of belief and behavior, is another basic one, and a number of investigations are underway that may shed additional light on it. For example, the associations of both sense of power and self-actualization with PCI-PCB congruence are being examined, as is the domino issue with regard to teacher PCB. In this case, the connection between principals' bureaucratic style and teacher pupil control behavior is being probed.

Some important difficulties characterize the PCB work. Because students furnish the data on educator PCB, the perception-reality problem will always cast a pause-giving shadow. Also, information on the PCB of primary teachers cannot be secured because the PCB Form must be read and understood by student respondents. Further, additional validity studies are necessary on the use of this device to tap the PCB of principals and counselors.

It is crucial to gain a better understanding of educators' pupil control behavior but I stop short of an all encompassing behaviorism. In a sense, attitudes are more fundamental since they are likely to be the source of a range of behavior; and, in spite of the rare, genuinely inscrutable individual, attitudes frequently are communicated by elusive, often non-verbal clues, especially in settings which, like teaching, are marked by intensive interactions. While behavior is more pliable than belief and, hence, more amenable to change, such change may be superficial unless sustained by more deep seated props.

In any case, some of these questions are empirical ones, and PCB research has a vast potential. This holds not only for explorations of the correlates of PCB, and for the PCI-PCB interface, but also for other relationships such as that between actual and preferred PCB.

Another topic that should be mentioned is that of test norms. We have not been particularly interested in developing standards for the PCI and PCB instruments based on large numbers of scores, for two reasons. First, our focus has been on hypothesis verification and we have considered the instruments to be essentially research devices rather than diagnostic tools. Secondly, the measures are both time bound and place bound.

They are time bound in the sense that some of their content applies to schools of current and recent vintage. Certain results are time bound because the common or predominate views of educators' on pupil control are subject to change based on shifting societal and professional values, and on alterations in other relevant social structures such as legal or economic ones. Thus, many of the social changes of the past decade tend to legitimate more humanistic orientations. The measures are place bound in the sense that they speak to features typical of American public schools. The extent to which these instruments are appropriate for use in other societies is a moot question, one being addressed for Australian schools in a program of research at the University of New England in New South Wales. At any rate, there are presently no plans to standardize the pupil control instruments. Such an effort has a low priority and could even be counter productive.

Another question concerns the relative desirability of humanistic and custodial orientations toward pupil control. It seems natural to embrace humanism as good and condemn custodialism as bad. This tendency is reinforced

by the general profiles of humanistic and custodial educators which show that qualities like open-mindedness, self-actualization, and creativity are associated with humanism.

However, we have pointed to possible unintended consequences of changes in humanistic directions in schools and contended that it is necessary to consider a variety of social system and organizational factors when contemplating such changes.[18] Administrative tragedies are made of good intentions that founder on social realities.

Our theoretical focus stresses the salience of client control and its consequences in educational organizations. However, I cannot agree with those who depict schools as overwhelmingly joyless and melancholy places. To the contrary, a considerable amount of joking, humor, and laughter is a common ingredient of school life. Schools are full of wags, if not wits.

Joseph Licata and I are currently investigating what we call student brinkmanship, student behavior that publicly gulls the system without substantial risk. Examples are the well known and sometimes contagious hyena laugh cultivated by some students, assumption of the exaggerated posture of a tin soldier when told to sit up, mock enforcement of teacher commands to others captured in the phrase, "Yeah, you guys, shut up!" and the noisy controlled crashes of student and equipment that result from "slipping" or "dropping" things and which are ordinarily followed by an apology after serving their purposes. Many acts of student brinkmanship are genuinely funny. We believe such performances relieve tensions and provide opportunities for expression in a setting that for students is characterized by subordination and extensive control. So we see schools as a curious combination of the concentration camp, the scout jamboree, and the situation comedy. The first arises from the mandated relation of organization and

client, and preoccupation with client control, the second reflects society's charge to the school to produce cooperation and good manners, and the third represents an adaptive response on the part of organizational participants. Hence, the guard, the scout leader, and the master of comic ceremonies all stand in juxtaposition within the teacher role. In underscoring the signal import of control in schools, it is essential that the part played by these other features of school life also be recognized.

As a final comment on the pupil control studies, I believe that more work should deal with pupil control as it bears on and is affected by fundamental structural features of schools. I have in mind such factors as the teacher autonomy norm, the strength of the teacher group and its formal association, the degree of stimulus overload faced by teachers, the amount and kind of environmental turbulence that threatens the school, levels of organizational adaptation, and goal displacement. Some of these concepts might be difficult to operationalize but it could prove to be theoretically fruitful to probe such relationships.

NOTES

1. See D. J. Willower and R. G. Jones, "Control in an Educational Organization," Studying Teaching, ed. J. D. Raths, et al. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.), 1967; and D. J. Willower, "The Teacher Subculture," Interpreting Education: A Sociological Approach, ed. L. W. Drabick (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts), 1971.

2. D. J. Willower, "Educational Change and Functional Equivalents," Education and Urban Society, 2 (August, 1970); "Social Control in Schools," The Encyclopedia of Education, ed. L. C. Deighton (New York: The Macmillan Co. and The Free Press), 1971.

3. D. J. Willower, "Hypotheses on the School as a Social System," Educational Administration Quarterly, 1 (Autumn, 1965).

4. D. J. Willower, T. L. Eidell, and W. K. Hoy, The School and Pupil Control Ideology (University Park: Penn State Studies No. 24, 1967). See also a statement on some of the issues and limitations in early work on pupil control in D. J. Willower, "Schools as Organizations: Some Illustrated Strategies for Educational Research and Practice," Journal of Educational Administration, 7 (October, 1969).

5. A. R. Helsel and D. J. Willower, "Toward Definition and Measurement of Pupil Control Behavior," Journal of Educational Administration, 12, (May, 1974).

6. D. J. Willower, T. L. Eidell, and W. K. Hoy, The School and Pupil Control Ideology (University Park: Penn State Studies No. 24, 2d ed. with an annotated bibliography of pupil control studies), 1973. Most of the works cited appear in this bibliography.

7. On dogmatism see Willower, Eidell, and Hoy, op. cit.; R. J. Heinman, "Relationships Among Selected Values, Levels of Dogmatism, and Pupil Control Ideologies of High School Principals," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1971; J. A. Keefe, "The Relationship of the Pupil Control Ideology of Teachers to Key Personal and Organizational Variables," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1969; and M. Williams, "The Pupil Control Ideology of Public School Personnel and its Relationship to Specified Personal and Situational Variables, "Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1972. On sense of power, see R. A. Zelei, "Relationship Between Pupil Control Ideology and Sense of Power of Teachers in Selected Public Schools," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Akron, 1971. On values and status obeisance see A. R. Helsel, "Value Orientation and Pupil Control Ideology of Public School Educators," Educational Administration Quarterly, 7 (Winter, 1971), and "Status Obeisance and Pupil Control Ideology," Journal of Educational Administration, 9 (May, 1971). The work on creativity which used a sample of college students planning to be teachers is G. Halpin and R. Goldenberg, "Relationships Between Measures of Creativity and Pupil Control Ideology," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American

Educational Research Association, New Orleans, 1973. On self-actualization, see L. E. Jury, "Teacher Self-Actualization and Pupil Control Ideology," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1973.

8. See Williams, op. cit., on local-cosmopolitan orientations, and D. J. Willower and C. A. Landis, "Pupil Control Ideology and Professional Orientation of School Faculty," Journal of Secondary Education, 45 (March, 1970), on professionalism. The study using the FIRO-B measure is C. Helwig, "Authenticity and Individual Teacher Interpersonal Needs," Journal of Educational Administration, 11 (May, 1973).

9. See J. B. McAndrews, "Teachers' Self-Esteem, Pupil Control Ideology and Attitudinal Conformity to a Perceived Teacher Peer Group Norm," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1971, on self-esteem. On race, see Williams, op. cit., and on personality charateristics see E. Leppert and W. K. Hoy, "Teacher Personality and Pupil Control Ideology," Journal of Experimental Education, 40 (Spring, 1972).

10. On PCI and verbal behavior see G. E. Rexford, D. J. Willower, and P. D. Lynch, "Teachers' Pupil Control Ideology and Classroom Verbal Behavior," Journal of Experimental Education, 40 (Summer, 1972); and R. Dobson, R. Goldenberg, and B. Elsom, "Pupil Control Ideology and Teacher Influence in the Classroom," Journal of Educational Research, 66 (October, 1972). On attitudes toward and use of an innovative curriculum, see W. K. Hoy and J. W. Blankenship, "A Comparison of the Ideological Orientations and Personality Characteristics of Teacher "Acceptors' and 'Rejectors' of BSCS Biology," Science Education, 56 (January-March, 1972); and P. L. Jones and J. W. Blankenship, "A Correlation of Biology Teachers' Pupil Control Ideology and their Classroom Teaching Practices," Science Education, 54 (July-September, 1970). The study of teacher PCB and student attitudes is W. Pritchett, "The Relationship Between Teacher Pupil Control Behavior and Student Attitudes Toward School," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1974.

11. Willower, Eidell, and Hoy, op. cit., and numerous other studies report differences in the PCI of teachers, principals, and counselors. On teacher trainers and cooperating teachers, see P. Longo, "Pupil Control Attitudes of Public School Cooperating Teachers and Education Instructors Affiliated with the Queens College Teacher Training Program, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1972. The Canadian data appear in J. O. Fritz, "Views of Schooling in Alberta High Schools," part 5 of a larger mimeo. report (Calgary: University of Alberta), 1973. Differences between elementary and secondary school educators have been found in a host of investigations. On sex, see J. S. Bean, "Pupil Control Ideologies of Teachers and Certain Aspects of Their Classroom Behavior as Perceived by Pupils," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, 1972; A R. Helsel, "Status Obeisance...," op. cit.; J. M. Budzik, "The Relationship Between Teachers' Ideology of Pupil Control and Their Perceptions of Administrative Control Style," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1971; and

Williams, op. cit., among others. The junior-senior high difference is reported in C. J. Warrell, "The Relationship of Organizational Patterns and Pupil Control Ideology of Teachers in Selected Junior and Senior High Schools," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1969. The junior high school-middle school comparison was made in A. P. McBride, "A Comparative Study of a Group of New Jersey Middle Schools and Junior High Schools in Relation to their Pupil Control Ideology and Selected Pupil Behaviors," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, 1972.

12. On administrator control styles see Budzik, op. cit., and on preferred educational frameworks see S. G. Weiss, "The Relationship Between Attitudes of Teachers of Emotionally Disturbed Children Toward Pupil Control and Their Selection of an Educational Framework and Classroom Approach," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1972. The work on bureaucratic styles is T. E. Jones, "The Relationship Between Bureaucracy and the Pupil Control Ideology of Secondary Schools and Teachers," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1969. On organizational climate see J. B. Appleberry and W. K. Hoy, "The Pupil Control Ideology of Professional Personnel in 'Open' and 'Closed' Elementary Schools," Educational Administration Quarterly, 5 (Fall, 1969); W. K. Hoy and J. B. Appleberry, "Teacher-Principal Relationships in 'Humanistic' and 'Custodial' Elementary Schools," Journal of Experimental Education, 39 (Winter, 1970); Keefe, op. cit.; and B. Waldman, "Organizational Climate and Pupil Control Orientation of Secondary Schools," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, 1971. The reference for schools with student unrest is S. P. Duggal, "Relationship Between Student Unrest, Student Participation in School Management, and Dogmatism and Pupil Control Ideology of Staff in the High Schools," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969. On student alienation, see W. K. Hoy, "Dimensions of Student Alienation and Characteristics of Public High Schools," Interchange 3 (1973); and M. Rafalides and W. K. Hoy, "Student Sense of Alienation and Pupil Control Orientation of High Schools," High School Journal, 55 (December, 1971). On absenteeism and suspension rates, see McBride, op. cit.

13. On socialization see W. K. Hoy, "Organizational Socialization: The Student Teacher and Pupil Control Ideology," Journal of Educational Research, 61 (December, 1967), "The Influence of Experience on the Beginning Teacher," The School Review, 76 (September, 1968), and "Pupil Control Ideology and Organizational Socialization: A Further Examination of the Influence of Experience on the Beginning Teacher," The School Review, 77 (September, 1969); P. A. Hamil, "An Analysis of the Observed Change in the Student Teacher's Pupil Control Ideology as Compared to the Pupil Control Ideology of the Cooperating Teacher," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1971; R. A. Roberts and J. W. Blankenship, "The Relationship Between the Change in Pupil Control Ideology of Student Teachers and the Student Teacher's Perception of the Cooperating Teacher's Pupil Control Ideology," Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 7 (1970); T. R. Garten and H. A. Gossen, "Student Teacher Socioeconomic Status and Pupil Control Ideology" (Warrensburg: Central Missouri State University, 1973),

mimeo.; D. G. Drozda, "The Impact of Organizational Socialization on the Pupil Control Ideology of Elementary School Teachers as a Result of the First Year's Teaching Experience," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1972. The Australian work is being done by J. T. McArthur at Monash University.

14. On PCI and SES of elementary schools see H. A. Gossen, "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Socioeconomic Status of Elementary Schools and the Pupil Control Ideology of Teachers," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1969. For secondary schools the source is B. J. Andrews, "Relationships Between Selected Community Variables and School Atmosphere," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, 1973. Faculty PCB and SES was examined in L. H. Brown, "Student Socioeconomic Status and Teacher Pupil Control Behavior, "Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1973. The study of perceived community viewpoints and PCI is reported in G. E. Gipp, "The Relationship of Perceived Community Educational Viewpoints and Pupil Control Ideology Among Teachers," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1974.

15. On pluralistic ignorance see J. S. Packard and D. J. Willower, "Pluralistic Ignorance and Pupil Control Ideology," Journal of Educational Administration, 10 (May, 1972); and D. J. Willower and J. S. Packard, "School Counselors, Pupil Control Ideology and Pluralistic Ignorance," Journal of the Student Personnel Association for Teacher Education, 10 (June, 1972). The report on conformity is McAndrews, op. cit.; and that on satisfaction is V. D. Yuskiewicz and D. J. Willower, "Perceived Pupil Control Ideology Consensus and Teacher Job Satisfaction," Urban Education, 3 (October, 1973).

16. The original paper on PCB is Helsel and Willower, op. cit. The dogmatism, PCI, PCB relationship and others are reported in A. R. Helsel, "Personality and Pupil Control Behavior," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1974.

17. This represents a refinement of my thinking on teacher socialization. See my, "The Teacher Subculture and Rites of Passage," Urban Education, 4 (July, 1969). It also speaks to Hoy's finding that teachers who moved to different schools after their first year did not fit the general pattern. Survival may still have been an issue for these teachers.

18. See Willower, Eidell, and Hoy, op. cit. chap. 4; and my "Educational Change and Functional Equivalents," op. cit., and "Schools, Values, and Educational Inquiry," Educational Administration Quarterly, 9 (Spring, 1973).